

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/696,928	10/30/2003	George E. Berkey	SP03-140	8228	
22928	7590 08/08/2005		EXAMINER		
CORNING INCORPORATED			LEPISTO, RYAN A		
SP-TI-3-1	137 14021		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CORNING, NY 14831			2883		

**DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005** 

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		<b>X</b> K	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
	10/696,928	BERKEY ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Ryan Lepisto	2883	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuly any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to bly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed  ays will be considered timely.  m the mailing date of this communication.  IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27.	<u>lune 2005</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	ance except for formal matters, p	rosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,4,7-18 and 20</u> is/are rejected.			
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,5,6 and 19</u> is/are objected to.	·		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.	·	
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 October 2003</u> is/ard		ed to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· ·	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1196	a)-(d) or (f)	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	p		
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		tion No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price			
application from the International Burea		iod in this reasonal stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	·	ved	
	t of the continue copies not reserve		
	·.		
Attachment(s)	_		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar		
<ul> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08</li> </ul>	Paper No(s)/Mail [ 5) Notice of Informal	Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/03, 6/04</u> .	6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/696,928

Art Unit: 2883

Page 2

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the restriction in the reply filed on 27 June 2005 is acknowledged. This is found persuasive after review of applicant's answer and after close examination of applicant's specification. The restriction requirement has been canceled and therefore the examiner has examined claims 1-20.

### Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Valente et al reference in the IDS filed on 30 October 2003 had a typo (given as 2003/0196992, should be 2002/0196992) in the document number. The examiner crossed out this reference and placed the correct document number on an empty space in the IDS. No further action is needed.

## **Drawings**

- 3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 601, 602, 650.
- 4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4).
  because reference character "650" has been used to designate both operating wavelength range and gain on page 7.

5. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 10-11, 13-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fermann (US 2002/0172486 A1). Fermann teaches a polarization preserving and highly birefringent optical fiber (greater than 10<sup>-6</sup>, paragraph 0070) laser and/or amplifier where the polarization is stable (mode-locked) and produces an enlarged output bandwidth range (Fig. 14) near 1030 nm (like applicant's) that includes the polarization range of the cavity (paragraphs 0003-0012, 0040-0041). The laser

amplifier comprises a pump signal source (Fig. 12) from a pump diode coupled to a waveguide (Figs. 1 or 5b) for exciting a plurality of active dopants (paragraph 0068) for providing gain (to function as an amplifier) to an output light that is broadband light that is selectively filtered by a grating (Fig. 12, paragraph 0087) by a predetermined wavelength range within a polarization wavelength range. The waveguide further comprises doped elliptical core (Fig. 1), either single asymmetric depressed clad (Figs. 6a-c, 7a-c), or a double-clad elliptical core waveguide (Figs. 1, 4b, 5b) with a apertures disposed about the core, inner clad and outer clad (paragraphs 0066, 0067, 0070).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fermann as applied to claims 1, 3-4, 7, 10-11, 13-18 and 20 above, and further in view of Sanders et al (US 5,912,910) (Sanders).

Fermann teaches the fiber laser/amplifier described above.

Fermann does not teach expressly an undoped single polarization fiber spliced to the polarization preserving and highly birefringent optical fiber or the grating being a Bragg grating or the single polarization device.

Sanders teaches pumped fiber laser/amplifier that uses a single polarization fiber with a Bragg grating (112) coupled to the pump source and polarization preserving and highly birefringent optical fiber (69) (Figs. 13, 17, column 22 lines 5-10).

Fermann and Sanders are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, pumped fiber lasers/amplifiers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to couple the pump source via a single polarization fiber with a Bragg grating as taught by Sanders in the system taught by Fermann in Fig. 12 wherein a pump source is coupled to a grating and to a polarization preserving and highly birefringent optical fiber.

The motivation for doing so would have been to increase power and efficiency by creating a polarized output beam by introducing polarization dependent loss (Sanders, column 22 lines 21-24).

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fermann as applied to claims 1, 3-4, 7, 10-11, 13-18 and 20 above, and further in view of Tumminelli et al (US 5,166,940) (Tumminelli).

Fermann teaches the fiber laser/amplifier described above.

Fermann does not teach expressly the dopant being Erbium.

Tumminelli teaches pumped laser/amplifier using a rare earth (Erbium) doped core with gratings.

Fermann are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, pumped fiber lasers.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Erbium as taught by Tumminelli in the system taught by Fermann since Fermann teaches rare earth elements may be used as the dopant (Fermann, paragraph 0069).

The motivation for doing so would have been increase output power by providing a dopant that provides necessary optical gain to effect lasing (Tumminelli, column 3 lines 53-56).

## Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 2, 5-6 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With regard to claims 2 and 19: These claims would be allowable over the prior art of record if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because the latter, either alone or in combination, does not disclose nor render obvious a PM fiber having fiber polarization components along a first linear characteristic mode and second linear characteristic mode with a sufficient differential polarization dependent loss between first and second modes

accumulated over a sufficiently long wavelength length such that the first polarization mode has a first attenuation of 3 dB at a first cut-off wavelength and a second polarization has a second attenuation of 3 dB at a second cut-off wavelength to provide the single polarization wavelength range having a single polarization center wavelength between the two cut-off wavelengths with the first cut-off wavelength being less than the second and the single polarization center wavelength is sufficiently close to the center operating wavelength or a linear single-polarization double-clad fiber laser having an elliptical shaped core to provide a large modal area having a core index delta to provide a numerical aperture of about 0.06 to 0.08, in combination with the rest of the claimed limitations.

With regard to claims 5 and 6: These claims would be allowable over the prior art of record if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because they depend from claims with allowable subject matter.

#### Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following are pertinent to the state of the art: Ball et al (US 5,513,913), Bayon et al (US 5,561,675), Kringlebotn (US 5,844,927), Kristensen et al (US 6,151,429), Sanders (US 6,301,273 B1), Dejneka et al (US 6,324,326 B1), Enomoto et al (US 6,490,078 B2), Broeng et al (US 6,542,681 B2), Zenteno (US

Application/Control Number: 10/696,928

Art Unit: 2883

Page 8

et al (US 2003/0152115 A1), Bohnert (US 6,885,784 B2).

**Contact Information** 

6,370,180 B2), Keaton et al (US 6,563,995 B2), Bohnert et al (US 6,597,821 B1), Jiang

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ryan Lepisto whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Frank Font can be reached on (571) 272-2415. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Lepisto

LAV

Frank Font

Art Unit 2883

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Date: 8/1/05

Technology Center 2800

Frank I Fort